



Editorial

Consultant outcomes publication and surgical training: Consensus recommendations by the association of surgeons in training



Keywords:

Consultant outcomes publication
Surgeon-specific outcomes
Surgical training

ABSTRACT

Consultant Outcomes Publication (COP) has the longest history in cardiothoracic surgery, where it was introduced in 2005. Subsequently COP has been broadened to include all surgical specialties in NHS England in 2013–14. The Association of Surgeons in Training (ASiT) fully supports efforts to improve patient care and trust in the profession and is keen to overcome potential unintended adverse effects of COP. Identification of these adverse effects is the first step in this process: Firstly, there is a risk that COP may lead to reluctance by consultants to provide trainees with the necessary appropriate primary operator experience to become skilled consultant surgeons for the future. Secondly, COP may lead to inappropriately cautious case selection. This adjusted case mix affects both patients who are denied operations, and also limits the complexity of the case mix to which surgical trainees are exposed. Thirdly, COP undermines efforts to train surgical trainees in non-technical skills and human factors, simply obliterating the critical role of the multidisciplinary team and organisational processes in determining outcomes. This tunnel vision masks opportunities to improve patient care and outcomes at a unit level. It also misinforms the public as to the root causes of adverse events by failing to identify care process deficiencies. Finally, for safe surgical care, graduate retention and morale is important – COP may lead to high calibre trainees opting out of surgical careers, or opting to work abroad. The negative effects of COP on surgical training and trainees must be addressed as high quality surgical training and retention of high calibre graduates is essential for excellent patient care.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of IJS Publishing Group Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. About ASiT

The Association of Surgeons in Training (ASiT) is a professional body and registered charity working to promote excellence in surgical training for the benefit of junior doctors and patients alike. With a membership of over 2700 surgical trainees from all 10

surgical specialties, the Association provides support at both regional and national levels throughout the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland. Originally founded in 1976, ASiT is independent of the National Health Service (NHS), Surgical Royal Colleges, and specialty associations.

2. Introduction and background

Consultant Outcome Publication was first introduced in cardiothoracic surgery in 2005 and later broadened to include most surgical specialties in England and some non-surgical interventional

Abbreviations: ASiT, Association of Surgeons in Training; COP, Consultant outcome publication; FTR, Failure to rescue; GMC, General Medical Council; HQIP, Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership; NHS, National Health Service.

specialties including cardiology in 2013–14 [1]. The introduction of Consultant Outcome Publication followed two major enquiries into patient care: the Bristol Heart Inquiry for Cardiothoracics, and subsequently the Mid-Staffordshire Inquiry [2,3]. While NHS England reports the aim of COP is to “spread best practice and identify any issues that need investigating”, ASiT is concerned about the potential risks of COP [4].

Patient safety and excellence in surgical training are key priorities of the Association of Surgeons in Training. Continued efforts to enhance the patient experience and deliver high quality care are essential. However, the method used to try and improve patient outcomes must be evidence based and must not have negative effects that outweigh the gains. ASiT has serious concerns about the use of COP as a tool to improve patient outcomes, as it has potentially deleterious effects on surgical training, and the data in its current form is open to misinterpretation.

3. How might COP affect surgical training and patient care?

Surgical training is an essential component of providing quality healthcare to both current and future patients. It has been well described that involvement of surgical trainees in operations with appropriate supervision is safe [5–11]. For example, Montroni et al. have recently demonstrated equivalent oncological accuracy and 30-day mortality for open right hemicolectomy performed by an attending (consultant) surgeon compared to a trainee [12].

Already, surgeons in training have reduced case exposure to operations than their predecessors, due to a combination of factors including the advancement of technology leading to a shift in certain procedures from a junior to a senior level, and the introduction of working hour restrictions without sufficient measures to safeguard training time [13–15]. This is reflected in studies of consultants reporting they feel inadequately trained to manage complex operative cases [16].

Reduced operative exposure in surgical training has been linked to worse patient outcomes [17]. Therefore, a potential impact of COP on trainee operative experience is highly concerning. This has been demonstrated by Khan et al. who found a significant decrease in trainee operating experience following the introduction of surgeon-specific outcome reporting in cardiothoracic surgery [18].

Secondly, there is a risk of surgeons “cherry-picking” cases, avoiding higher risk but necessary surgeries [19,20]. Penna et al. report that up to 25% of colorectal surgeons surveyed report avoiding operating on higher risk patients because of COP [21]. This is not in patients or trainee's interests as it reduces the complexity of case mix required for senior trainees and denies patients appropriate surgery.

Thirdly, publication of surgeon specific outcomes is in line with the old “Captain of the Ship” model. Under this model, the surgeon has vicarious responsibility for everything that impacts the care of a patient, e.g. a fire in the operating theatre. However, human factors training for surgical trainees now emphasises the importance of the multidisciplinary team and has moved away from this model. The multidisciplinary approach has proven importance in improving outcomes, e.g. surgical site infection [22]. COP risks eroding this teamwork with subsequent detriment to both patient safety and team functionality.

4. Evidence based medicine-does COP measure up?

There has been little evidence to show that publication of surgeon-specific data improves outcomes [19, 23] and a significant concern when publishing COP, is the use of inaccurate or misrepresented data. Manktelow et al. have cautioned that even with risk-

adjustment, if patient populations differ in case mix standardised mortality rates may vary even for two clinicians who are performing equally [26]. Accurate data collection, analysis and interpretation are therefore essential. A recent study showed that over 90% of colorectal surgeons surveyed had concerns regarding the current COP reporting method [21]. Hospital resources and infrastructure, rather than the performance of individual clinicians, often contribute to negative patient outcomes. By focusing on the surgeon alone, the complex resource issues that lead to poor outcomes may be missed. Timely identification of a patient with a complication is crucial in avoiding post-operative mortality. Failure to rescue (FTR) is a key outcome in surgery. FTR is influenced by numerous factors outside the individual surgeon's direct control, including medical, nursing and allied healthcare professional staffing levels and availability of critical care support [23, 24]. Ozdemir et al. have demonstrated that modifiable hospital resources affect outcome after ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm [25]. In the era of multidisciplinary care, comprehensive unit outcome analysis may improve health outcomes, be more helpful to patients and lend greater impetus to developing safe departments than COP. Unit-outcome analysis demonstrates a more true-to-life metric of the patient journey within a hospital, allowing for real sources of potential error to be identified and corrected. In addition, proper adjustment for complexity is essential to avoid promoting “cherry-picking” as described above [20]. Publication of unit-level data may also be more acceptable to surgeons [21].

5. Impact on surgeon well-being-the second victim

Publication of surgeon-specific outcomes in their current form have thus far promoted annual “naming and shaming” of surgeons. This can have a devastating effect on a surgeon's career, confidence and mental health. Without addressing concerns regarding case-mix adjustment and accuracy of data presented, there is the possibility of excellent surgeons being inappropriately vilified by inaccurate and misrepresented data. Negative publicity carries significant risks. For example, the problem of doctor-suicides while under Fitness to Practice Investigation with the GMC is well documented [27, 28]. It is known that surgeons experience significant ill-effects to their mental and physical health following an adverse patient outcome-indeed, this has led to the controversial term the “second victim” [29]. Surgeons often suffer from severe psychological stress when complications arise, which may in fact negatively impact patient outcomes as this may impede their performance [29]. COP may add even further pressure to surgeons in this context, to the detriment of patients and surgical training [19].

6. Graduate retention and attractiveness of a surgical career

Finally, we must consider the attractiveness of surgery as a career with the potential development of a culture of public and personal “naming and shaming”. This may affect the recruitment of top calibre candidates into surgery, and the retention of surgical trainees and consultants. Already, there has been a significant decline in UK graduates pursuing a career in cardiothoracic surgery in the NHS over the decade since the introduction of COP [30]. Newly qualified surgeons may be encouraged to seek work outside the UK or NHS, in jurisdictions where they feel less at risk of unfair negative publicity.

7. Recommendations

1. There has been little evidence to show that publication of surgeon-specific data improves outcomes [19,22]. Unit-level

data may represent a more accurate reflection of the care processes and be a more powerful catalyst for positive change.

2. Publication of unit or hospital-specific data rather than COP, using adequately designed tools, could have a positive effect on surgical training allowing trainees to select high performing units for their training.
3. There must be blame-free mechanisms for surgical trainees, staff and patients to report concerns about hospital resources and infrastructure. Reporting unit-level outcomes may be more meaningful in changing patient outcomes and more acceptable to the surgical community [31].
4. The data collection process must be robust, accurate and reliable. Poor quality, incomplete and poorly adjusted data misinform the public and unfairly damage both the profession and individual surgeons, as well as leading to anxiety and distress for patients. Independent systems for submitting data, which are designed specifically for this purpose, must be invested in.
5. Risk adjustment is paramount to avoid a tendency to cherry-pick cases. Unless properly risk adjusted, surgeons may select cases of lower complexity. This may therefore negatively affect future surgical patient populations and surgical training.
6. HQIP recently published a guidance document on COP, however it makes no reference to the impact on surgical training and does not list surgical trainees as stakeholders in the process [1]. Surgical trainees are important stakeholders in COP as it may adversely affect their training. Secondly, they are the surgical consultants of the future. Any negative impact on surgical training is of grave concern.
7. Every effort must be made to ensure trainees are afforded adequate opportunities to achieve requisite training numbers. If considering consultant outcomes, their record as a trainer should also be considered. There must be an emphasis placed on the importance of training the next generation of surgeons in considering COP.
8. Publication of COP may impact the time available to consultants to provide training, by resulting in an increased administrative workload. We ask that all consultants be supported with adequate administrative support and a manageable timescale to complete these important audit tools. Time allocated for COP and for training should be included in consultants' job plans.

8. Conclusion

The ability of a healthcare system to continue to deliver excellence in surgical care is based on tomorrow's consultant surgeons receiving excellent training today. Publication of COP may negatively impact patient safety and surgical training. Safeguards to protect training, accurate data collection and appropriate risk adjustment are essential. Publication of unit-level outcomes may be a more meaningful outcome measure.

Conflict of interest

The authors are current surgical trainees and current elected members of the Council of the Association of Surgeons in Training. The authors have no other relevant financial or personal conflicts of interest to declare in relation to this paper.

Funding

Nil.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge Peter Radford, Laura Derbyshire, Joseph Shalhoub and J Edward Fitzgerald.

References

- [1] Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership, HQIP Consultant Outcomes Publication, 2015. <http://www.hqip.org.uk/consultant-outcomes-publication> [Accessed 12th April 2015].
- [2] The Report of the Public Inquiry into Children's Heart Surgery at the Bristol Royal Infirmary 1984–1995: Learning from Bristol, Chaired by Ian Kennedy, 2001. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090811143745/http://www.bristol-inquiry.org.uk/final_report/the_report.pdf [Accessed 30th June 2016].
- [3] Report of the Mid Staffordshire Foundation Trust Public Enquiry, Chaired by Robert Francis QC, 2013. <http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/report-of-the-mid-staffordshire-nhs-foundation-trust-public-enquiry> [Accessed 30th June 2016].
- [4] NHS choices, Consultant Treatment Outcomes, <http://www.nhs.uk/choiceintheNHS/Yourchoices/consultant-choice/Pages/consultant-data.aspx> [Accessed 12th April 2015].
- [5] S.N. Zafar, A.A. Shah, Z.G. Hashmi, D.T. Efron, E.R. Haut, E.B. Schneider, D. Schwartz, C.G. Velopulos, E.E. Cornwell 3rd, A.H. Haider, Outcomes after emergency general surgery at teaching versus nonteaching hospitals, *J. Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 78 (1) (2015) 69–76.
- [6] P. Singh, E.J. Turner, J. Cornish, A. Bhangu, National Surgical Research Collaborative. Safety assessment of resident grade and supervision level during emergency appendectomy: analysis of a multicenter, prospective study, *Surgery* 156 (1) (2014) 28–38.
- [7] A.Y. Oo, A.D. Grayson, A. Rashid, Effect of training on outcomes following coronary artery bypass graft surgery, *Eur. J. Cardiothorac. Surg.* 25 (4) (2004) 591–596.
- [8] V. Kanakala, V. Bawa, P. Gallagher, S. Woodcock, S.E. Attwood, L.F. Horgan, K. Seymour, Outcome of patients in laparoscopic training courses compared to standard patients, *Surgeon* 8 (3) (2010) 132–135.
- [9] M. Kelly, A. Bhangu, P. Singh, J.E. Fitzgerald, P.P. Tekkis, Systematic review and meta-analysis of trainee-versus expert surgeon-performed colorectal resection, *Br. J. Surg.* 101 (7) (2014) 750–759.
- [10] S.E. Handagala, E. Addae-Boateng, D. Beggs, J.P. Duffy, A.E. Martin-Ucar, Early outcomes of surgery for oesophageal cancer in a thoracic regional unit. Can we maintain training without compromising results? *Eur. J. Cardiothorac. Surg.* 41 (1) (2012) 31–34.
- [11] R. Baron, V. Sujendran, N. Maynard, Should oesophagectomies be performed by trainees? The experience from a single teaching centre under the supervision of one surgeon, *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* 90 (4) (2008) 305–309.
- [12] I. Montroni, F. Ghignone, G. Rosati, D. Zattoni, A. Manaresi, M. Taffurelli, G. Ugolini, The challenge of education in colorectal cancer surgery: a comparison of early oncological results, morbidity, and mortality between residents and attending surgeons performing an open right colectomy, *J. Surg. Educ.* 71 (2) (2014) 254–261.
- [13] M. Greensmith, J. Cho, R. Hargest, Changes in surgical training opportunities in Britain and South Africa, *Int. J. Surg.* 25 (2016) 76–81.
- [14] K.J. Breen, A.M. Hogan, K. Mealy, The detrimental impact of the implementation of the European working time directive (EWTD) on surgical senior house officer (SHO) operative experience, *Ir. J. Med. Sci.* 182 (3) (2013) 383–387.
- [15] The Association of Surgeons in Training, Optimising Working Hours to Provide Quality in Training and Patient Safety, 2009. http://www.asit.org/assets/document/ASiT_EWTD_Position_Statement.pdf.
- [16] A. Brooks, W. Butcher, M. Walsh, A. Lambert, J. Browne, J. Ryan, The experience and training of British general surgeons in trauma surgery for the abdomen, thorax and major vessels, *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* 84 (6) (2002) 409–413.
- [17] R. Babu, S. Thomas, M.A. Hazzard, A.H. Friedman, J.H. Sampson, C. Adamson, A.R. Zomorodi, M.M. Haglund, C.G. Patil, M. Boakye, S.P. Lad, Worse outcomes for patients undergoing brain tumor and cerebrovascular procedures following the ACGME resident duty-hour restrictions, *J. Neurosurg.* 121 (2) (2014) 262–276.
- [18] O.A. Khan, S. Iyengar, D.E. Pontefract, V. Rogers, S.K. Ohri, S.A. Livesey, Impact of surgeon-specific data reporting on surgical training, *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* 89 (8) (2007) 796–798.
- [19] S. Westaby, K. Baig, J. Pepper, Publishing SSMD: the risks outweigh the benefits, *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl. Suppl.* 97 (4) (2015) 155–159.
- [20] D. Rosser, R. Lilford, Using surgeons outcome data for quality control, *Health Serv. J.* (2013). <http://www.hsj.co.uk/home/innovation-and-efficiency/using-surgeons-outcome-data-for-quality-control/5059613.article#VSu0XlqRhUQ> [Accessed 30th June 2016].
- [21] M. Penna, B. Moran, S. Crane, R. Hompes, C. Cunningham, Surgeon-specific outcome reporting-is it time to move forward? *Colorectal Dis.* (2016) <http://>

- dx.doi.org/10.1111/cosi.13433 [Epub ahead of print].
- [22] E.P. Dellinger, Teamwork and collaboration for prevention of surgical site infections, *Surg. Infect. (Larchmt)* 17 (2) (2016) 198–202.
 - [23] P.D. Radford, L.F. Derbyshire, J. Shalhoub, J.E. Fitzgerald, Council of the Association of Surgeons in Training, Publication of surgeon specific outcome data: a review of implementation, controversies and the potential impact on surgical training, *Int. J. Surg.* 13 (2015) 211–216.
 - [24] M.J. Johnston, S. Arora, D. King, G. Bouras, A.M. Almoudaris, R. Davis, A. Darzi, A systematic review to identify the factors that affect failure to rescue and escalation of care in surgery, *Surgery* 157 (4) (2015) 752–763.
 - [25] B.A. Ozdemir, A. Karthikesalingam, S. Sinha, J.D. Poloniecki, A. Vidal-Diez, R.J. Hinchliffe, M.M. Thompson, P.J. Holt, Association of hospital structures with mortality from ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm, *Br. J. Surg.* 102 (5) (2015) 516–524.
 - [26] B.N. Manktelow, T.A. Evans, E.S. Draper, Differences in case-mix can influence the comparison of standardised mortality ratios even with optimal risk adjustment: an analysis of data from pediatric intensive care, *BMJ Qual. Saf.* 23 (9) (2014) 782–788.
 - [27] S. Horsfall, Doctors Who Commit Suicide while under GMC Fitness to Practice Investigation. Internal Review, GMC, December 2014.
 - [28] K. Hawton, Suicide in doctors while under fitness to practise investigation, *BMJ* 350 (2015) h813.
 - [29] L.M. Marmon, K. Heiss, Improving surgeon wellness: the second victim syndrome and quality of care, *Semin. Pediatr. Surg.* 24 (6) (2015) 315–318.
 - [30] S. Westaby, K. Baig, R. De Silva, J. Unsworth-White, J. Pepper, Recruitment to UK cardiothoracic surgery in the era of public outcome reporting, *Eur. J. Cardiothorac. Surg.* 47 (4) (2015) 679–683.
 - [31] K.L. Sherman, E.J. Gordon, D.M. Mahvi, J. Chung, D.J. Bentrem, J.L. Holl, K.Y. Bilimoria, Surgeons' perceptions of public reporting of hospital and individual surgeon quality, *Med. Care* 51 (2013) 1069–1075.

Helen M. Mohan^{1,2}, Vimal J. Gokani^{1,2}, Adam P. Williams^{1,2},
 Rhiannon L. Harries^{*,1,2} On behalf of the Council of the Association
 of Surgeons in Training
 Association of Surgeons in Training, 35-43 Lincoln's Inn Fields,
 London, WC2A 3PE, UK

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Rhiannon.harries@gmail.com (R.L. Harries).

8 July 2016

Available online 20 September 2016

¹ www.asit.org.

² <https://twitter.com/ASiTofficial@ASiTofficial>.